



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## A P P E N D I X.

### THE SEMI-CENTENARY OF THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

THE completion of the fiftieth year of the existence of the North American Review is an event of such importance in its career, and of such interest in relation to the periodical literature of America, as to justify special commemoration. Few if any other quarterly or monthly periodicals in this country have attained so long a continuance of life, and no other similar publication has been more ably sustained, or received more constant and cordial support from the public.

The long line of its one hundred volumes contains the record of a period full of changes in the political and social, as well as the literary, conditions of the country, and through this series of years the Review has done good service, not only in maintaining and advancing the standard of American letters and scholarship, but also in defending the principles on which American institutions rest, and in illustrating their value and adaptation to the needs of free society. It has not been unfaithful to the pledge implied in its great name, and those among its founders who still survive to receive the respect of their countrymen may look back with honorable satisfaction to the share they had in the establishment of a journal which has held so high a place, and acquired so creditable and well-deserved a reputation.

The history of the North American Review, if written in full, would be the history of the progress of American literature for fifty years. The earlier years of this century were years of small things in letters. The intellectual energies of the people were employed in other than literary pursuits. Not one American author had yet won for himself enduring popularity or distinction. There were no greater names in our national

literature than those, now perhaps too much neglected, of Trumbull, Dwight, and Charles Brockden Brown. Irving had published in 1809 his *Knickerbocker's History of New York*, but his triumphs had scarcely begun. Everett left college in 1811; Prescott, in 1814; Bancroft, in 1817. In Boston there was more literary cultivation and activity than in other parts of the country. Buckminster and Channing had raised the style of pulpit eloquence, no less than the character of religious thought. The Anthology Club brought together a good number of clever men, and the "*Monthly Anthology*" was by far the best magazine that had been published in America. But the Anthology ceased to appear in 1811, and a journal of wider scope and higher character was required to meet the needs of the times.

What those needs were, and with what design the North American Review was established, are set forth in the following extract from an essay by Mr. William Tudor, the founder of the Review.

"The powerful influence of the French Revolution and the universal interest it excited in all civilized countries, not only pervading the literature of every nation, but marshalling all the world in its contagious quarrels, had for well-known reasons an extraordinary dominion in this country. Political sympathies and antipathies gave a bias to all our opinions. In addition to which, we were so young in the career of literature, we ran so much risk of adopting barbarisms both in taste and sentiment, from the passionate vehemence of party feelings, and the presumption of rash pretenders, that many sound scholars saw no other mode to avert the threatened evils, than to show unlimited deference to the great standards of English learning. In following this course, they sometimes confounded the ideas of time and space; and blended the respect that was due to what was consecrated by the former, with a deference to opinions protected only by the latter, which might be often prejudiced, interested, and unsound. The danger that might thus arise is obvious; it may be compared to the apprehension that is felt in some countries respecting those who believe in the Papal supremacy, which if it could be confined to spirituals would be almost a matter of indifference, and is only dreaded on account of its opening a passage to the insidious entrance of political influence and the possession of temporal power. The admiration that was so justly felt for the illustrious names of English literature and politics in past ages, was often blindly given to their living descendants, whose infirmities were invisible at a

distance. These feelings sometimes produced a little too much severity in judging our own productions, and rather more submission to foreign criticism than impartial justice would have dictated in either case. The consequence was occasionally a want, or rather a suppression, of national feeling and independent judgment, that would sooner or later have become highly injurious.

"To counteract the tendency of this state of things, which, if I have not succeeded in describing it very clearly, will still be understood by many persons, was one of the chief motives in establishing this *Review*. The spirit of the work was national and independent as regarded foreign countries, yet not falling under the dominion of party at home; and the tone of it, in these respects, is I think different from that of any preceding journal. This tone it has always preserved, with one or two slight exceptions, and I do not know how far my vanity will be pardoned in making a claim to some agency in establishing it, as the only one I have to any merit connected with that work.

"The citizens of the United States are not yet emancipated, nor can they expect to be for some time to come, from a degree of dependence on foreign opinion in everything regarding literature. Yet criticism is every day gaining ground among us, obtaining wider influence as it displays greater talent, and the period is perhaps not very distant when foreign literary decisions will be sought for principally under the impulse of curiosity; and our own tribunals will be esteemed the supreme authority." \*

The circumstances attending the establishment of the North American are stated in a communication which the present editors of the Review have had the pleasure of receiving from the Hon. Willard Phillips, and which they have much satisfaction in being permitted to publish. Judge Phillips says:—

"In December, 1814, and January, 1815, an association was formed for starting a literary periodical, consisting of John Thornton Kirkland, then President of Harvard College, Edward T. Channing, afterward Professor in that institution, myself, and I think one or two others, of which, however, I am not certain. The title proposed was 'The New England Magazine and Review,' and I was to be editor of it. Articles of association were adopted, and sundry meetings were held, the records of which were made by Mr. Channing as secretary, and, as I have been told, a copy of them is still extant. In this stage of our

---

\* Miscellanies, by the Author of "Letters on the Eastern States," (Boston, 1821, 12mo,) p. 56.

progress Dr. Kirkland learned that a similar publication had been projected by Mr. William Tudor, then just returned from his travels in Europe,\* a gentleman in high esteem for his social and literary accomplishments. The field was thereupon left open to Mr. Tudor, under whose editorship the first number of 'The North American Review and Miscellaneous Journal' was published, in May, 1815.†

"At the end of the first year Mr. Tudor passed the Review to our original association, offering to continue his editorship another year gratuitously, the articles to be contributed or procured by us. The association was then remodelled, and as remodelled consisted of John Gallison, the reporter of the early decisions of Judge Story in the Circuit Court of the United States; ‡ Nathan Hale, editor of the Boston Daily Advertiser, and well known for his indefatigable industry, his ability and probity, and the active part he took in divers public improvements; Richard H. Dana, who still survives with merited honors;

---

\* Subsequently author of the Life of James Otis, and Consul of the United States at Rio Janeiro.

† It was to come out every alternate month. After September, 1818, it appeared quarterly, and after April, 1821, "Miscellaneous Journal" was dropped from the title.

‡ John Gallison was a young man of uncommon force of character, moral excellence, and intellectual distinction. He died in Boston, in 1820, at the early age of thirty-two. He had won the affection and respect of a large circle of friends, and his life had given such promise that his death was regarded as a public loss. A brief memoir of him was written by Dr. Channing, and is to be found in the volume of Channing's Discourses, Reviews, and Miscellanies, published in 1830. In speaking of his views on the subject of war, Dr. Channing states the following facts, which give evidence of the superiority of Mr. Gallison's judgment and intelligence, and have a special interest at the present day. "He believed that society had made sufficient advances to warrant the attempt to expunge from the usages of war the right of capturing private property at sea. He believed that the evils of war would be greatly abridged, and its recurrence checked, were the ocean to be made a safe, privileged, unmolested pathway for all nations, whether in war or peace; and that the minds of men had become prepared for this change, by the respect now paid by belligerents to private property on shore, a mitigation of war to be wholly ascribed to the progress of the principles and spirit of Christianity. His interest in this subject led him to study the history of maritime warfare, and probably no man among us had acquired a more extensive acquaintance with it. Some of the results he gave in an article in the North American Review [July, 1820] on Privateering, and in a Memorial to Congress against this remnant of barbarism. To this field of labor he certainly was not drawn by the hope of popularity; and though he outstripped the feelings of the community, his efforts will not be in vain. He was a pioneer in a path in which society, if it continue to advance, will certainly follow him, and will at length do justice to the wisdom as well as purity of his design."

An article on the "Character of Mr. Gallison," written by Mr. Phillips, appeared in the North American for April, 1821. — Eds.

Edward T. Channing; William P. Mason, successor to Gallison as reporter; myself, and Jared Sparks, whose name has been familiar to the public from that day to this. Mr. Sparks, then Tutor in Harvard College, acted as editor [from May, 1817], and Mr. F. C. Gray, though not taking any responsibility in the conduct of the work, was almost as constant in his attendance at our meetings as the others I have named, and a frequent contributor of valuable communications.

“When the Review came into our hands it was in need of the most rigid economy in its pecuniary means. No pay was offered for articles, and the allowance of twenty-five per cent commission to the publishers seemed to weigh heavily upon it. This commission I proposed to save by taking the copies from the printers to my office, and with such assistance as I could command they were addressed and despatched to subscribers, this labor not being then so onerous as we could have wished. But the former publishers, Messrs. Wells and Lilly, afterwards liberally offered to continue to be publishers gratuitously for one year.

“We held meetings weekly at Gallison’s rooms, at which our own articles and those of friends and correspondents were read and criticised and decided upon. Some of our literary friends attended our meetings by invitation to read their own contributions, or to hear those of others upon subjects in which those invited were skilled and supposed to take interest. We also solicited articles upon particular subjects from literary friends at a distance. These meetings were kept up with much interest, vivacity, and harmony, and the zeal and spirit of our association were by degrees infused into our correspondents, and resulted in the increase of our subscription list, and in contributions of articles.

“The work was conducted in this manner for some time. In May, 1818, Mr. Channing became editor, assisted by the same coadjutors, excepting Mr. Sparks, who then, if I remember rightly, left Cambridge for Baltimore.

“I leave the subsequent history of the Review to others.”

The history of the Review is taken up at the point where Judge Phillips leaves it by the Hon. Edward Everett, in the following interesting communication, which the editors owe to his kindness.

“I assumed the editorship of the *North American Review* in January, 1820, having been requested to take charge of it when I returned from Europe in October, 1819.

“The Review was at that time still the property of the association of gentlemen mentioned by Judge Phillips, by whom I was invited to be-

come the editor. They had been in the habit of holding stated meetings to consider the articles offered for insertion, and this practice was for a while kept up in my time. But it was attended with inconvenience ; I lived in Cambridge, the other members lived in Boston ; contributions did not abound ; often came in at the last moment, and when it would have been impossible, while the press was stopping, to call a special meeting of the Club. Under these circumstances the sole editorship gradually passed into my hands.

"When I assumed the conduct of the journal, it barely paid its expenses, yielding no *honorarium* to editor or contributors. The subscription was stationary ; five or six hundred, if I remember rightly, at the outside. It rose so rapidly under the new *régime*, that three editions were published of one or more of the numbers of the new series, and two of some others. I acted as editor for the years 1820, 1821, 1822, 1824, eight volumes.\* The editorship was then assumed by Mr. Sparks, but on his going to Europe, I again, at his request, took charge of the Review during his absence.

"The Review had, from its foundation, received the contributions of the most respectable scholars and writers of this neighborhood, and of a few from other parts of the United States. This continued more and more to be the case in my time. There was scarcely a person of liter-

---

\* The character that the Review sustained under the editorship of Mr. Everett is indicated by the following remarks, which appeared as a foot-note to an article by Lord Jeffrey, on the Sketch Book, in the Edinburgh Review for August, 1820.

"While we are upon the subject of American literature, we think ourselves called upon to state, that we have lately received two numbers, being those for January and April last, of 'The North American Review or Miscellaneous Journal,' published quarterly at Boston, which appears to us to be by far the best and most promising production of the press of that country that has ever come to our hands. It is written with great spirit, learning, and ability, on a great variety of subjects ; and abounds with profound and original discussions on the most interesting topics. Though abundantly patriotic, or rather national, there is nothing offensive or absolutely unreasonable in the tone of its politics ; and no very reprehensible marks either of national partialities or antipathies. The style is generally good, though with considerable exceptions, — and sins oftener from affectation than ignorance. But the work is of a powerful and masculine character, and is decidedly superior to anything of the kind that existed in Europe twenty years ago.

"It is a proud thing for us to see Quarterly Reviews propagating bold truths and original speculations in all quarters of the world ; and when we grow old and stupid ourselves, we hope still to be honored in the talents and merits of those heirs of our principles, and children of our example."

After the lapse of nearly fifty years the North American may reciprocate the good wishes of the Edinburgh, with the hope that at the end of the century it may still flourish, and, emulating its early honors, may once more display the same qualities which gave it distinction and influence at the beginning. — Eds.

ary, scientific, or professional eminence in this part of the country that did not, first or last, appear as a writer in the North American Review. Among those who wrote at least one article, — most of them more than one in my time, — I may mention among the deceased, Chief Justice Shaw, Mr. Webster, Judge Story, Dr. Bowditch, Mr. John Pickering, Mr. John Gallison, Professor Farrar, Mr. F. C. Gray, Mr. Henry Wheaton (then of New York), Mr. W. J. Spooner, Mr. W. H. Prescott, Drs. John Ware and Enoch Hale, Professor Sidney Willard, Mr. Nathan Hale, General T. Lyman, Professor Kingsley of New Haven, and my brother, Mr. A. H. Everett, then *Chargé d'Affaires* at the Hague and Brussels. These all have passed away; *omnes composui*. Of those who remain, and who rendered me valuable assistance by writing at least one article, many of them several, I may name Messrs. Willard Phillips and W. Powell Mason, and J. G. Palfrey, (members of the Club,) W. C. Bryant, Professor Theophilus Parsons, President Sparks, Mr. J. G. Cogswell, Mr. J. C. Gray, Mr. Justice Metcalf, Mr. Edward Brooks, Dr. Jacob Bigelow, Mr. G. B. Emerson, Dr. N. L. Frothingham, and Mr. Caleb Cushing. The late Mr. William Sturgis wrote a very valuable article on the Northwest Coast of America. The too unhappily remembered Professor J. W. Webster wrote two or three articles on scientific subjects of considerable value. During my first editorship my most frequent and efficient contributor was my brother, A. H. Everett, who continued to render me the most essential aid during Mr. Sparks's absence in Europe. At this time the twin brothers, the Messrs. Peabody, rendered me invaluable aid. Their articles were always punctually sent in, were always well written in pure, unaffected, idiomatic English, always interesting and instructive. Mr. Caleb Cushing was also one of my most valuable contributors.

“During my first editorship, I was just entering on my duties as a Professor at Cambridge, and when I resumed the conduct of the journal, I was a member of Congress, and of course, on both occasions, I had other arduous duties upon my hands. Being obliged to depend upon my own pen for too large a proportion of the matter that filled the pages of the Review, I often wrote hastily, now and then *musâ involât*; but the public was favorable, and allowance was made for the circumstances in which I was placed. On one occasion, being desirous of reviewing Dean Funes' History of Paraguay, Buenos Ayres, and Tucuman, published at Buenos Ayres in 1817, in 3 vols., 8vo, and having no knowledge of Spanish, I took lessons for three weeks of good Mr. Sales, and at the end of that time the article was written. There is, however, nothing remarkable in this, for a person having some knowledge of the Latin, French, and Italian.



"The foregoing enumeration of contributors, both deceased and living, is incomplete, and relates chiefly to my first editorship. It is hardly necessary to say, that I have never ceased to feel a deep interest in the journal. I continued to be a frequent contributor to it till I went to Europe a second time, in 1840. Since that time, under the pressure of official and other duties and cares, I have very seldom written an article, (the last was in January, 1856, being a review of the sixth edition of Mr. Wheaton's International Law,) the rather as the succeeding generation, in the number and ability of its writers, and the higher standard of periodical literature, has made all assistance from its predecessors unnecessary."

The following letter, with which the editors have been favored by the Hon. J. G. Palfrey, continues the history of the Review, with a series of pleasant reminiscences.

Boston, 1864, December 7.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

"My dear Sirs : — You desire me to acquaint you with some of my 'recollections of the foundation of the Review, of its early course, and of its history' while I was its editor. If I am to relate that 'which I saw, and part of which I was,' I must perforce be egotistical.

"The first number of the Review was issued in May, 1815, when I was a youth in College, and of course was not so situated as to be informed respecting the circumstances of the enterprise.

"Before the autumn of 1819, my only connection with the work was that of an occasional contributor. My first essay in it, I believe, was in May, 1817, — a review of Professor Willard's 'Hebrew Grammar,' discussing the origin and value of the Masoretic punctuation. In another piece, in the next following number, on the first series of 'Tales of my Landlord,' the authorship of Scott's novels being still unknown, I argued the identity of the author of 'Marmion' and 'the author of Waverley' from the identity of the manner of presenting battle scenes in the novels and in the poems.\* Another contribution of mine, a little later, had for its subject the poem by Mr. Eastburn and Mr. Sands of New York (*quis desiderio sit modus?*) entitled,

---

\* Shall I set down a little incident relating to this matter ? In the summer of 1819, I dined at Kingston, Upper Canada, with the officers of a Scottish regiment. One of the theories of the day was, that "the author of Waverley" was Sir Walter's brother, who was paymaster of that regiment. He was not at the table ; but I sat next to an officer named *Dalgetty*. (Whether his other name was *Dugald*, I did not learn.) The coincidence was suggestive.

‘Yamoyden, a Tale of Philip’s War.’ I find it, without surprise, to have been a specimen of quite exuberant youthful rhetoric, but it was not too far behind the taste of the time to be received with favor.

“Glancing at the contents of the work in the early days to which I have hitherto referred, I find them illustrated by names which were already, or have since been, recognized as among our greatest in literature, in science, or in other walks of the public service. Let me (*absit invidia*!) specify some of them. It was through these pages that, in 1817, Bryant burst into fame with his ‘Thanatopsis,’ and ‘Lines to a Waterfowl.’ John Adams contributed a series of papers on the Order of Jesuits. Gulian Verplanck wrote on the ‘History of the New Netherlands’; Daniel Webster, on the Battle of Bunker Hill, and on the third volume of Wheaton’s ‘Reports’; Judge Story, on Hoffman’s ‘Course of Legal Study,’ and on Maritime Law. President Kirkland furnished two articles on University Education; Mr. (afterwards President) Quincy, one on the Commerce of the United States, and one on Agriculture; William Jones Spooner, and Francis William Winthrop, both of whom death took away early from the prospect of a brilliant course, showed in this work some of the qualities that still keep their memory green in some hearts. John Pickering discussed in two papers his favorite subjects of Education and Philology. Andrews Norton treated the Inaugural Discourse of his friend, Professor Frisbie, and the Life and Writings of Dr. Franklin. Richard H. Dana wrote a few times. Francis C. Gray was a frequent contributor. Dr. Gilman (afterwards of Charleston, South Carolina) produced a series of most spirited metrical versions of Satires of Boileau. From Europe, where he was studying, George Ticknor sent one article or more. Prescott, I believe, did not so early profit the Review with any work of his. Years afterwards, when I was editor, with that strict method that characterized him, he used to give me one article a year, — neither more nor less, except in one year, when, instead of the article of customary length, he gave me two, covering together the normal number of pages.

“When, in the autumn of 1819, Mr. Edward T. Channing, having been appointed Professor of Rhetoric and Oratory at the University, withdrew from the charge of the work, I first became an associate of the gentlemen who owned it, and by whom, as in the previous period, arrangements continued to be made, and contributions to be examined. At this time the immediate supervision of the Review was intrusted to Mr. Edward Everett, then just returned from Europe, who presently raised and extended its reputation by the numerous productions of his fluent and scholarly pen. The publication was now changed from

bi-monthly to quarterly ; and, miscellaneous matter being excluded, the work took the form of the English Reviews.

“After three or four years more, it came to be felt as a burden by men, all of whom had now other engrossing pursuits and objects ; and Mr. Sparks, who had come back to Boston from Baltimore, where he had lived three years, was disposed to take it under his sole charge. In the autumn of 1823, the editorship and (by purchase) the property of the Review were accordingly transferred to him, and the association was disbanded. While he was editor, that increase of the circulation of the work, which had been so great from the beginning of Mr. Everett’s connection with it, was continued. He introduced into it the new feature of the ‘Critical Notices.’ Before his time, unless my memory misleads me, nothing had been paid for the literary contributions. The writers were mostly young, and their pens were moved by the impulses which are apt to stimulate young scholars. In those days too, though there was less scholarship than now, literary eminence or promise constituted, relatively to other things, a higher claim than it does now to social position. Boston was then a place of little wealth, and of simple habits and tastes. It was provincial, but it was hearty, and it esteemed learning and literary ambition.

“After the voluntary system of contribution was disused, the pay was always uniform, so far as I know, however famous or obscure the contributor. It had never been higher, when, in 1843, I relinquished the management of the Review, than a dollar for the page of *small pica* type, and two dollars for the page of *long primer* used in the ‘Critical Notices.’

“Mr. Alexander H. Everett, who had been Minister of the United States to the Spanish Court, bought the work of Mr. Sparks in the summer of 1830, and became its editor ; and in the same manner it came into my hands after the publication of the last number of the year 1835. I had occasionally written for it in the preceding years, and during part of the time of Mr. Sparks’s absence in Europe, in 1825, I had had charge of it as editor. I may mention, as an occurrence which can scarcely be supposed to have escaped my memory, that on the first night after the property of the work became mine, a large portion of the stock of back-numbers was consumed by fire, — not a cheerful beginning.

“It would be impertinent for me to specify the embarrassing circumstances in which I conducted the work for seven years. I will, however, remind you that, during more than half of that period, I was at the head of one of the professional schools of the University, lecturing and teaching eleven times every week, and one of the three Sunday

preachers in the University Chapel; and that, within the same time, I wrote and published two volumes of an elaborate treatise on the Hebrew Scriptures. It is not unreasonable to presume that I should have managed the *North American Review* more to my own satisfaction and to that of the public, had fewer occupations of a different nature divided my attention. Its circulation, however, was not understood to have declined between the time when I received it and the time when, with a confident hope of seeing it inspired with new life, I parted with it to Professor Bowen.

“At all events, whatever deficiency there was, was my own. I had coadjutors of the first quality. The former editors, Channing, Sparks, and the brothers Everett, and the later editors, Bowen and Andrew P. Peabody, all gave me valuable contributions from time to time. Among eminent persons now living who helped me were Professor Peirce; Admiral (then Lieutenant) Davis; Governor Cass, who sent me results of his observations in Egypt and in Mexico; Willard Phillips; Caleb Cushing; George S. Hillard; William H. Gardiner; William H. Prescott; George W. Greene, of Rhode Island, then living in Italy; Dr. Worcester, the lexicographer; Richard H. Dana, Jr.; Oliver Wendell Holmes; Charles Francis Adams; Mrs. Fanny Kemble Butler; Mrs. Robinson, the very learned and accomplished wife of the distinguished traveller in the Holy Land, who gave me some papers of the utmost curiosity on the poetry of Southeastern Europe; President Wayland; Charles Sumner; Ralph Waldo Emerson; and Henry W. Longfellow. Among those now dead were Moses Stuart; Andrews Norton; Rufus Choate; Captain Slidell McKenzie, of the Navy; Colonel Whiting, of the Army; Cornelius C. (since President) Felton; Henry Ware, Jr.; James H. Perkins, of Cincinnati, a short-lived man of rare ability; John Pickering; Franklin Dexter; Henry R. Schoolcraft, the Indian explorer; George Sumner; Henry D. Gilpin, of Philadelphia, President Van Buren’s Attorney-General, a scholar of various and elegant culture; Professor Kingsley, of New Haven; Nathan Hale; Dr. Robinson; and the twin brothers (Oliver William Bourne and William Bourne Oliver) Peabody.

“Since I am in the garrulous vein, let me dwell for a moment on the recollection of these two men of beautiful genius. They died about the same time, sixteen years ago. I knew them well almost all their lives. I was their schoolmate and playmate for two years, and their college contemporary for three years more; and our relations were kept up with some intimacy as long as they lived. So like were they, that I never knew them apart. To my perception, the resemblance was perfect in face, form, mien, voice, movement, and manner. Their hand-

writing was peculiar, but the handwriting of each was to me undistinguishable from that of the other. Both were copious writers in poetry and prose. Their style of thought and of writing was very marked. It had a character of delicacy, tenderness, grace, vivacity, and humor altogether its own. It could not be mistaken for the style of any other person but the twin brothers. But it seemed absolutely the same in both.

“As I turn over the ancient pages that revive the figure that they made when they came to be corrected for the press, here and there an editorial embarrassment and distress, with its extrication or disaster, recur to my memory. When promises proved deceptive, — as editorial experience shows that they sometimes will, — and the unprovided quarter-day for a public appearance was approaching with a step every moment sounding louder on the excited nerve, there was no succor for which I looked with more confident hope than that which my admirable friend, President Felton, was always able and ready to afford. His prompt and important kindnesses to me in this way constitute not one of his highest claims, but one of his substantial claims to my grateful and affectionate remembrance.

“Sometimes, on the contrary, there was an *embarras de richesses*. The longest paper I ever inserted in the Review was the learned and able one (in the number for January, 1838) on Prescott’s ‘Ferdinand and Isabella,’ then just issued. The preparation of the article had been delayed till the number was almost due, and as I had perfect confidence in the writer, I began to print soon after he began to write, and he kept on just before me, sending instalments of his manuscript day by day. What with the fertility of his mind, the extent and interest of the subject, and his ardor for his friend, his work grew to unexpected proportions as he proceeded; Alps on Alps arose; I had made no sufficient provision of paper for such an affluence of discussion, and the printer reported that his stock was out, while the manuscript continued to flow in. I sent him to buy paper wherever it could be found; and, luckily for the credit of my punctuality and for the gratification of the public, who would not have been willing to lose a line of such a composition, the market proved to be sufficiently supplied.

“Some other *contretems* of a different kind come up to my remembrance. For the July number of 1836, my old friend, Judge Bullard of Louisiana, had furnished me a carefully argued paper on the relations between Mexico and Texas. From certain premises, largely set down, he proved that Texas was the certain prey of General Santa Anna, then in hot march upon it. Whether or not from some misgivings of my own as to the result, I held back the printing of this article

till June. At last, however, it was all, or nearly all in type, when one fine morning came news of Houston's rout of the Mexican host at San Jacinto. Here was a skein to unravel. Judge Bullard's premises had to stand, — they were a fixed quantity ; — but his conclusion had to be superseded. The curious reader may learn what kind of a piece of work I made of it — I have not refreshed my own memory as to this — by turning to the article.

“ When Antonio Gallenga was in this country under the name of Luigi Mariotti, he furnished me a few articles for the *Review*, which were full of life and of knowledge. He had not then learned to write English as he has written it since, and his pieces required a good deal of working over to rid them of inaccuracies as to idiom, though frequently, on the other hand, his turns of phrase had striking idiomatic force and beauty. In the April number of 1838, he contributed a paper which I published, on the life and death of Marie Louise, ex-Empress of France. I was so simple as to presume, on this showing, that she had paid the debt of nature. Whether he was equally ignorant on the subject, I am to this day uninformed, though, all things considered, I may be pardoned for having my strong suspicions. Certain it is, that some years later the living Austrian may have read the story of her death in the *North American Review*.

“ For another and a deeply mortifying mishap, I have myself to blame, and I have never ceased to take myself severely to task for it. Fifteen years ago, there was in Boston an Englishman of some literary note, who had lived in Belgium. After writing for me two or three times, and very unexceptionably and agreeably, he offered me a piece on the Belgian Revolution, which I readily accepted. I was overwhelmed with other engagements at the time, in the midst of a course of semi-weekly lectures, of which nearly every one was written after its predecessor was delivered ; the Belgian Revolution, to my heedless view, was as free from elements of offence, as the Equator seemed to Sidney Smith ; and, as to the mere execution of the piece, I knew the person in question to be an educated and practised writer. In these circumstances, I was misled into an indiscretion of which I was never guilty at any other time, before or afterwards. I allowed the piece to go to the press without examination, and it appeared in my number for January, 1841. I did not read it, or think of it again, when it was in print. Judge what were my amazement and dismay when, two years later, a friend pointed out to me that it had been made the vehicle of an indecent affront to one of the most eminent of European statesmen, — a man as admirable for all personal qualities of mind and character, as conspicuous for the honors of a great public career. The case admitted of

no apology. If apology had been possible, the time for it had passed by. There was nothing for me but to bear my chagrin and shame in silence.

"I have tried carefully to recollect myself for these slight statements. But I cannot answer for the absolute exactness of all of them.

"Faithfully yours,

"JOHN G. PALFREY."

The Review passed into the hands of Mr. Francis Bowen at the close of 1842, and was edited by him until the close of 1853. It gave conspicuous proof during this period of the industry, ability, and various acquisition of the editor, and of the excellence of the contributors by whom he was assisted. On Mr. Bowen's appointment as Professor of Moral Philosophy in Harvard University, he was succeeded in the charge of the Review by the Rev. Andrew P. Peabody, D. D., who continued to edit it until the close of 1863. The character it has sustained during these years is well known to the present generation of readers. Its history since Dr. Palfrey retired from its editorship is too recent to be narrated with propriety in detail. On the list of its contributors during this period may be found the eminent names of Motley, Holmes, Asa Gray, H. W. Torrey, A. H. Clough, R. H. Dana, Jr., T. W. Higginson, E. P. Whipple, and J. Foster Kirk,—a worthy continuation of a catalogue which begins with such names as Irving, Bryant, Prescott, Ticknor, and Bancroft.

The last twenty years have wrought great changes in the conditions of literature in America, corresponding to the changes in our social and political conditions. The natural results of the continued working of our institutions have shown themselves in the development of a marked national character, in such a diffusion of property, comfort, and intelligence among the mass of the people as no other nation has ever known. The activity which is the combined result of external circumstances and free institutions has been exhibited not less in intellectual than in material progress. Common schools have made a nation of readers, and literary production has kept pace with cultivation. American literature is now independent, conscious of its strength, aware of its defects, and stimulated to excellence by such rewards as were never before or

elsewhere offered to success in literary achievement. But in many respects our literature is still unsatisfactory as an expression of the national character. It displays too frequently the want of simplicity and thoroughness. It is too often deficient not only in form and finish, the results of a high standard of taste, but in the more substantial qualities of thought and learning. It is defaced by the pretensions and worthless productions of an ignorance often unconscious of its own incapacity. It is not yet worthy of its unrivalled opportunities.

But the present war is deepening the thoughts of men, and has given to the people a fresh and stronger conviction of the worth of truth, and of the fact that education, in its largest and highest sense, is the only means by which our institutions can be securely maintained and successfully worked. Literature must share, is already sharing, in the new and better impulses of the times. As one of the great instruments of education a demand is made upon her, a demand which she will answer, for greater sincerity, simplicity, directness, and thoroughness.

It is sometimes said that the days of the Quarterlies is passed, that in these days of speed men cannot wait, as their predecessors could well do, for an opinion, three months after the event, and cannot find time to read the careful essay on matters which have been already discussed and settled by the daily or monthly press. No doubt the excellence and the wide diffusion of newspapers and monthly magazines have rendered the comparative position of the Quarterly Review very different from what it formerly was. But it still has a definite place to fill, and a valuable work to perform. To say nothing of its lighter functions, it addresses itself to the limited, though still large class in the community, who are themselves the leaders and formers of popular opinion; to those who are not averse to serious thought on the most important topics of the times; to those who desire to know and be instructed by men who have made a study of special subjects, and are willing to communicate the results of their studies to the public. The Quarterly need not always follow, it may precede the daily press. It may not, perhaps, control, but it may hope sometimes to rectify public opinion. And one of its most impor-



tant functions is more purely literary ; it is to hold up a high standard of thought, of learning, of style, and by vigorous and independent criticism to improve, so far as lies within its power, the public taste. It is no trivial work thus to help in the formation of a literature worthy of the nation.

And to perform this work the Review must rely not only on the efforts of those who have it immediately in charge, but on the assistance and support of men who are competent to render it,—of genuine scholars, of sound and liberal thinkers, who believe in, and are working for, the progress of their country and of mankind.

If the North American Review shall receive such aid, and thus be enabled to accomplish even in part the work which such a Quarterly may perform, it will anticipate with confidence the happy arrival of its one hundredth birthday.